



STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

MICHAEL F. EASLEY
GOVERNOR

LYNDO TIPPETT
SECRETARY

**North Carolina Board of Transportation
Environmental Planning and Policy Committee
Meeting Minutes for March 2, 2005**

A meeting of the Environmental Planning and Policy Committee (EPPC) was held March 2, 2005 at 8:30 AM in the Board Room (Room 150) of the Transportation Building. Board Member Nina Szlosberg chaired the meeting. Other Board of Transportation members that attended were:

Conrad Burrell	Doug Galyon
Mac Campbell	Marion Cowell
Bob Collier	Cam McRae
Andy Perkins	Tom Betts
Larry Helms	

Other attendees included:

Mark Ahrendsen	M.L. Holder	Sandy Nance
Loretta Barren	Sheila Holman	Brock Nicholson
Tom Betts	David Hyder	Tom Norman
Donnie Brew	Tim Johnson	Behshad Norowzi
Mike Bruff	Neil Lassiter	Ken Pace
Eddie Dancausse	Don Lee	Benton Payne
Veronica Davis	Sharon Lipscomb	Roger Sheats
Craig Deal	April Little	J.J. Swain
Glenn Dennison	Ehren Meister	John Sullivan
Steve DeWitt	Mike Mills	Dan Thomas
Terry Gibson	Barry Moose	Greg Thorpe
Gail Grimes	Jon Nance	Don Voelker
Teresa Hart		

Ms. Szlosberg called the meeting to order at 8:30 AM and circulated the attendance sheet.

Ms. Szlosberg announced there would be a couple items added to the agenda that could move through quickly. The first issue, which had come before us twice prior, was a resolution on stream mapping. A revised draft of the resolution was provided to the EPPC members. Ms. Szlosberg reminded the committee that the last time they met they were concerned about moving forward with this, as they weren't sure where it was in the Governor's budget. Ms. Szlosberg stated the Governor's budget did have funds included for stream mapping as part of the North Carolina One Map. This was a little more than \$0.5 million. Then, the Hurricane Recovery Act

was passed and appropriated about \$2.6 million for Phase 1 of the stream-mapping plan. Also approved was another \$9.3 million to fly LIDAR in the mountain counties which would be necessary for flood plain mapping. Thus, the resolution was retooled to remove specific funding but kept the spirit of the resolution supporting the stream-mapping project. A motion was passed to accept the resolution as rewritten for forwarding to the full Board of Transportation for consideration. A copy of the draft resolution is attached to these minutes.

Ms. Szlosberg accepted a motion to approve the meeting minutes from the February committee meeting as amended for minor grammatical and spelling corrections. The minutes were approved.

Ms. Szlosberg distributed several copies of a report on Charlotte Air Quality from the Southern Environmental Law Center (SELC). The SELC is an advocacy group basically dealing with legal issues. Sometimes NCDOT been on opposite sides of the bench from them, but often times we've worked together as we do with many organizations. The SELC has done a lot of air quality work in Georgia. Atlanta was taken to task and sued over some air quality issues and lost their federal funding for a while, which we are obviously trying to avoid. The SELC is now looking at urban areas in North Carolina, beginning in Charlotte.

Marion Cowell stated that the SELC has suggested tools, which are laid out thoroughly in the report. They have met with a number of city officials and groups on air quality issues in the Charlotte region.

Ms. Szlosberg stated that SELC would be reviewing the Research Triangle area to complete a similar report and she would be working with them. And, they will also be looking at the Triad. Ms. Szlosberg stated she would be providing more copies of the report for the Transportation building.

Eddie Dancausse of FHWA gave a federal perspective on air quality conformity. The following is a summary of major points:

- Transportation conformity ("conformity") is a way to ensure that Federal funding and approval goes to those transportation activities that are consistent with air quality (AQ) goals.
- Conformity applies to Long Range Transportation Plans (LRTPs), Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs), and projects funded by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) or Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in nonattainment or maintenance areas.
- A Conformity Determination is triggered one year after designation of a new regulation (which is currently a June 15, 2005 deadline for us), after adoption or amendment of a LRTP, after adoption or amendment of a TIP, when the State Implementation Plan (SIP) changes, or every three years.
- The Transportation Conformity Process is an interagency consultation process involving: Environmental Protection Agency, FHWA, FTA, State and Local Transportation Agencies (includes Metropolitan Planning Organizations, also referred to as MPO's), and State air quality agencies. All these partners have to concur with the different steps in the process for it to be successful.

- There are 11 major tasks in the Transportation Conformity Process, which takes about a year to complete:
 1. Interagency Consultation (IC) Meeting – Agreement on the process and development of a list of action items
 2. Transportation Modeling—Tasks 2-4 consume about 60% of the time required to complete the entire process
 3. Emission Factor Development
 4. Regional Emissions Analysis
 5. Draft Conformity Determination Report (CDR)
 6. Agency Review of CDR—legislative requirement for a 21-day review of CDR
 7. Public Review and Comment Period—typically 30-45 days as dictated by the area's public involvement process
 8. Final CDR
 9. MPO Transportation Advisory Committee makes conformity determination and adopts the Transportation Plan and TIP
 10. Federal Review of the Final Conformity Determination Report and LRTP—this is a 30-day review process
 11. USDOT Conformity Determination Letter
- North Carolina currently has five LRTP Updates and Conformity Determinations due on three different dates:
 - April 15, 2005--Mecklenburg County (1-hour ozone)
 - May 28, 2005--Winston-Salem Forsyth MPO (1-hour ozone)
 - June 15, 2005--Triangle Area, Metrolina Area, and Rocky Mount Area (8-hour ozone)
- The TIP Conformity Process can take either 6 or 12 months to complete depending on whether or not a full modeling and analysis has to be completed.
 - 6 months if the TIP is the same as the LRTP—full modeling and analysis not required
 - 12 months if the TIP is not the same as the LRTP—full modeling and analysis is required
- North Carolina also has Conformity Determinations due for the next three TIPs:
 - October 1, 2005 (06-12 TIP). Meeting this deadline is feasible if the TIP comes out in April and is not different from the LRTP. Otherwise, there will be a challenge meeting the deadline.
 - October 1, 2006 (07-13 TIP)
 - October 1, 2008 (09-13 TIP)
- When a conformity determination cannot be made, **the use of Federal Aid funds is stopped** which impacts design work, right-of-way acquisition, construction, and permitting.

Sheila Holman, NCDENR Division of Air Quality (DAQ), provided a State Air Quality perspective. Her presentation is summarized below.

- Ms. Holman showed a map highlighting areas where we have been dealing with Transportation Conformity based on the one-hour ozone standard since the mid 90's. These areas included Charlotte, the Triangle and the Triad. Also, since the late 80's, we've been working with four counties not meeting the carbon monoxide standards. These were Mecklenburg, Forsyth, Durham, and Wake.

- Ms. Holman explained that in 2004 EPA moved forward with two new standards—the 8-hour ozone and Fine Particle standards. The 8-hour ozone nonattainment areas were designated with an effective date of June 15, 2004, starting the one-year Transformation Conformity clock. The EPA designated the Fine Particle (PM_{2.5}) nonattainment areas with an effective date of April 5, 2005, also starting a one-year clock for the PM_{2.5} conformity process.
- “Designations” are areas labeled by EPA for violating a health-based standard, which sets into motion a lot of Federal requirements. These requirements include the Transportation Conformity Process and development of the State Implementation Plan (SIP).
- Ms. Holman presented a map identifying 20 counties in North Carolina violating the 8-hour ozone standard. Several of these counties are involved in what is called an Early Action Compact Process, which means the conformity process has not been triggered for them (Cumberland, Caldwell, Catawba, Alexander, Burke, and the Triad counties). The message is that the conformity process has become much more complex with the addition of many more areas of nonattainment.
- Ms. Holman presented a timeline of key milestones starting with the June 15, 2004 effective date of the ozone nonconformity designations:
 - Immediately any new industrial source coming into these areas must undergo a “New Source Review” requiring a much more stringent permitting process.
 - One Year—Transportation Conformity Deadline
 - Three Years—State Implementation Plan Due
 - Five-Six Years—Depending on Area Classification—Must Attain Standards
- Three counties are in violation of the PM_{2.5} Fine Particle Standard (Catawba, Davidson, and Guilford). These areas have until April 2006 for Transportation Conformity, April 2008 for the SIP, and April 2010 for Attainment.
- DENR’s Division of Air Quality’s role in Transportation Conformity is to:
 - Monitor air quality
 - Recommend Nonattainment Boundaries
 - Develop the State Implementation Plan (SIP) including the mobile emissions budgets
 - Provide emission factors for conformity analysis based on speed projections and request from NCDOT or MPO
 - Review final conformity report
- Ms. Holman explained that a SIP is a solution to an air quality problem. It is the overall plan for attaining or maintaining a national ambient air quality standard. It contains the rules for control measures necessary for attainment or maintenance. It involves a public hearing process and can take a couple years to do all the technical work.
- In conclusion, Ms. Holman presented concerns for this next year:
 - By February 2006, three SIPs must be completed (8-hour Ozone, PM_{2.5}, and Regional Haze) which will require a tremendous amount of technical work.

- Much technical work has already been done on the Transportation Conformity Analyses with a good chance to meet the June 15, 2005, deadline.
- However, if the TIP is significantly different from the plan being used for analyses, the analyses will have to be redone with a strong potential for missing the Federal SIP deadlines and impacting transportation funding.

Mark Ahrendsen, Durham City Transportation Manager and Chair of the Technical Coordinating Committee of the Durham/Chapel Hill/Carrboro MPO, presented a local perspective on the current air quality challenges, which included two main points: (1) the timing of release of the Draft 2006-12 TIP and submission of the priority list for the 2007-2013 TIP and (2) the relationship of the LRTP and AQ Conformity Report to the 2006-2012 TIP

Mr. Ahrendsen began addressing his first point by acknowledging the improvement of going to a 2-year TIP cycle versus the 12-month cycle in the past. The longer cycle allows time for meaningful public input, release of a draft, meaningful review and interaction with locals and the MPO for development of a final TIP. Under this 2-year cycle, the draft 2006-2012 TIP would have been released last year allowing 12 months for review, dialogue and finalization. However, for a variety of reasons, the draft will not be released until April 2005 and approved in July 2005. The draft 2007-2013 TIP is to be released in October 2005 with a request for MPO priorities to be submitted by June 2005 (a month before the 2006-2012 TIP is released).

Mr. Ahrendsen stated his concerns and consequences of the above schedule. First, it allows little time (3 months) for input and dialogue before the final TIP. This represents a return to the old 12-month cycle. Second, by having to submit the priority list for the 2007-2013 TIP by June 2005, the MPOs, RPOs and public will not have knowledge of what is in the 2006-2012 TIP. Lastly, the overlap of these cycles creates confusion for everybody.

Mr. Ahrendsen then suggested that NCDOT delay release of the draft 2007-2013 TIP until later, perhaps December or January, to clearly separate the two processes. The NC Association of MPOs supported this suggestion at a meeting just a week ago on February 25, 2005.

Mr. Ahrendsen then moved to his second main point addressing the relationship of the LRTP, TIP, and AQ Conformity report. The Capital Area MPO and the Durham/Chapel Hill/Carrboro MPO have just completed a lengthy process of AQ Conformity Analysis based on our LRTPs adopted in September of last year. These MPOs are expected to make a determination in April 2005 that their respective long range plans conform with the air quality requirements so that the Federal agencies can make that determination and avoid any lapse of any Federal transportation funds. This conformity analysis is based on the project schedule contained in the 2004-2010 TIP. It is imperative that the schedule of these projects is the same in the 2006-2012 TIP as in our LRTPs. If these schedules are different it will mean a long process of analyses and we will likely not meet the deadlines and lose eligibility for Federal transportation funds.

In summary, Mr. Ahrendsen requested the following:

1. release the draft 2006-2012 TIP as soon as possible;
2. delay release of the 2007-2013 TIP; and
3. ensure the year of implementation of projects for 2007-08-09 time frame in the 2006-2012 TIP are in agreement with our LRTPs and conformity analysis.

Mike Bruff, NCDOT Transportation Planning Branch Manager, attempted to tie these pieces together. He began by expressing his concerns with the situation and that Mr. Ahrendsen's

concerns for Durham are shared by the MPOs in the areas with conformity problems. Mr. Bruff noted that the presenters covered issues well and stated he is extremely concerned about possibility of Winston-Salem going into lapse for 3 or 4 months while they are working on loop schedules. Also mentioned were the Triad and Raleigh areas with projects moving around and maintaining consistency with the TIPs. Mr. Bruff shares the same concerns as the local and DAQ partners.

Ms. Szlosberg asked if the committee members had questions.

Ms. Szlosberg stated that there are projects that contribute to air quality and asked the question of how does one go about determining which projects are contributing to positive air quality so as to be able to pull them out for priority funding.

Sheila Holman answered that when they do conformity analysis they look at the whole network for a particular year and the vehicle emissions from the whole network rather than looking at the emissions benefits of individual projects. So it is really hard to say which project is going to help and which is going to hurt.

Eddie Dancausse reinforced that the regional analysis is of all the projects as a total.

Ms. Szlosberg summarized her understanding that the LRTPs are fiscally constrained and should provide a positive air quality benefit. If we have a TIP that is not consistent with the LRTP, we cannot guarantee air quality benefits to the Federal government and must go back and do analysis of the revised TIP. Eddie Dancausse confirmed that summary.

Mark Ahrendsen followed up that the LRTP is a package of roughly 200 projects with certain years of implementation with a cost of those in total. The projects within a year are not ranked. An anticipated level of funding is assumed and a group of projects are selected. If the funding is lowered in a year, projects will have to be pulled out.

Ms. Szlosberg posed a scenario where Project A is to reduce congestion with a completion date of 2012. There is a possibility that it could be delayed by 3 or 4 years. One explanation Ms. Szlosberg said that she'd heard previously was that so long as it falls within the 20-year window of the LRTP, it is OK. Then, Ms. Szlosberg asked if it somehow gets measured in 5-year increments. Eddie Dancausse explained that it depends on the "horizon" year, which could be 2009, 2010, or 2020. Thus, the project could move so long as it doesn't go beyond the horizon year.

Ms. Szlosberg stated that the date is not the date it is let but the date the project is completed or open to whatever traffic it is. So delays in a let also mean delays in completion. Mike Bruff stated this is one of the biggest issues we have with project scheduling and PMii, which is that normal TIP changes have to be checked against plan conformity and can trigger a conformity analysis. Accelerating or delaying a project can have implications from an air quality standpoint requiring a 9 to 12-month conformity analysis process. Or you can reschedule that project but you cannot take any Federal action on that project until you complete that analysis and make sure your plan is conforming. And those horizon years are not the same for each area. So, for every area you have for nonattainment or maintenance, you have a different year and different bucket of projects to be aware of.

Ms. Szlosberg asked why some counties are under a 1-hour standard and others under an 8-hour standard.

Sheila Holman answered that those counties under the 1-hour standard are based on air quality data from 1987-89. Now the 8-hour standard is used. And, some counties are under both standards. For the Mecklenburg and Triangle regions, the 1-hour standard is expected to be revoked on June 15, 2005. Because the Triad area is an Early Action Compact area and because the 8-hour attainment designation has not taken effect, it will still have the 1-hour standard. This will continue until such time as EPA makes that designation.

Board Member Tom Betts questioned whether any State procedures or requirements conflicted with or exceeded the Federal requirements. Brock Nicholson, DAQ, stated that none of the State's requirements are at odds with the federal requirements. North Carolina's Clean Smokestacks Act might reasonably help. North Carolina has expanded its vehicle inspection program, which also helps bring emissions down. So, one might reason that we are not in conflict and are probably doing a little better.

Tom Betts followed up asking if we were working in concert rather than in conflict with the Federal agencies. Sheila Holman answered that she believed we are working in concert. Eddie Dancausse added that when he is going through the process, FHWA gets involved early in the process (during the 21-day review) to work out all the issues and that the last 30-day review is pretty much a paper exercise.

Tom Betts asked if there is any finger pointing at the end of the process. Eddie Dancausse replied that as we go through the process we always try to deal with the issues so we don't wait until the last minute and don't get into finger pointing. Sheila Holman added that she felt all the partners have worked together extremely well together to try and meet the June 15, 2005 deadline and are continuing to do that.

Roger Sheats stated that we have several fiscal issues on the table right now like the equity formula and pushing back a billion dollars in the TIP. There is no way that a billion dollars is going to be resolved by 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012. These issues are making it more difficult to stay in conformity across this State.

Mike Bruff stated that the longer the delay in making the decision on the draft TIP, the longer it is going to create problems for all of those counties shown on the map. Even if you are in a rural county surrounding an urban area, you are likely to see problems. Not only do we have to do conformity in the MPOs and their metropolitan areas but also in the "collar" counties.

Mark Ahrendsen elaborated that ideally the nonattainment areas that have to develop conformity plans would prefer that the Board release a 2006-2012 TIP that is consistent (in terms of years of implementation of projects) with the LRTPs and conformity analysis that has already been done. If that happens, it will be pretty clear sailing. The MPOs understand the financial constraints and understand that may not happen. Given that, then the sooner we know the better. Then, the sooner the conformity plans can be updated and the shorter we can make that likely lapse period.

Ms. Szlosberg resurfaced an earlier question stating that if you can't rate all the projects according to air quality significance, (having heard something about "regionally significant projects"), is there a way to look at each Division and identify regionally significant projects. Mike Bruff answered that they are listed in the LRTPs as regionally significant projects. The

LRTPs also divide the projects by the horizon years with completion dates and identify the project costs.

Ms. Szlosberg asked, for example, if the TTA projects in the Triangle would be considered regionally significant. Mike Bruff and Eddie Dancausse confirmed that was correct.

Ms. Szlosberg asked how other transit projects fell. Eddie Dancausse answered that it is a three-tiered issue. Projects considered in conformity are:

- all federally funded projects
- non-federally funded but regionally significant
- exempt projects—those that are outside the conformity analysis that would not be impacted by a lapse as long as the TAC would adopt a TIP of these projects

Ms. Szlosberg asked if EPA would have to sign off on these projects. Eddie Dancausse answered that it is an interagency decision.

Roger Sheats stated he felt responsibility to make sure we understand what the ripples look like and where they might roll out in the State. He stated that he is not convinced we will have consistency with these documents (the TIP and LRTPs), so he believes we will be in the 12-month cycle. He asked for someone to tell the Board what areas are likely to roll into a lapse period this year.

Mike Bruff answered that Winston-Salem has an extremely good likelihood to be affected and then asked Behshad Norowzi of NCDOT's Transportation Planning Branch to provide input.

Behshad Norowzi stated that the draft to the Draft TIP doesn't appear to cause major issues for air quality conformity across the state. However, we have to be especially careful regarding the Triangle and Metrolina areas. He stated that the NCDOT's Transportation Planning Branch highly recommends the following:

- Release of Draft TIP 2006-2012 as soon as possible;
- Reflect any needed major changes to 2007-2013 TIP instead of 2006-2012 TIP; and
- Release 2007-2013 later than early October to avoid confusion

Board Member Larry Helms commented that the Board members are working with the staff to try to make sure that these changes are not such that causes nonconformity to happen. There is a lot of interaction between the Board members and the Charlotte-Mecklenburg staff to make sure that any changes that are done consider everything that can be done to not go into nonconformity. He'd hate for someone come out and say that Charlotte is going into nonconformity; there is a lot of activity going on to make sure that smart decisions are made. Mr. Helms wanted to be sure people know about the collaborative efforts that are underway to prevent conformity lapses.

Board Member Marion Cowell commented that there seems to be a certain calmness about the fact that we are going to have two significant areas of this State going into nonconformity. Mr. Cowell stated he doesn't understand why we seem to be so calm about it and not moving to rectify the problem. He understood that we have two significant areas on the threat of nonconformity. Nobody's really talking about what's going to happen if we fall into nonconformity. Mr. Cowell states that he's been hearing for months that there's likely not going to be any extension of dates to get into conformity. It seemed to him that if this actually

happened, if this is actually allowed to occur, we've created some incredible disaster that could have been avoided.

Ms. Szlosberg added that we have a wonderful opportunity right now. All of us are looking real hard at our numbers -- real hard at our projects; not that we don't do it all the time. But it is under the microscope right now. So, we have an opportunity to avoid the situation that Mr. Cowell sees coming down the road or is alerting us to.

Marion Cowell stated he didn't know about this at the beginning but as soon as this became apparent, as it has been for the last 6-8 weeks, we went through Charlotte Department of Transportation (C-DOT). And, Mr. Cowell stated that he thinks the Director of C-DOT is the chair of the committee that is looking at the region issues for air quality. And, they had a list of projects that they said could not be delayed because of the air quality issues. Now, in the meantime, the issues that this gentleman has been talking about the 2006-2012 and 2007-2013 issues are creating big time issues for the group in Charlotte. And he felt sure they were elsewhere in the State. So, in the sense of trying to be accommodating, we tried to provide the data that would be needed and he thought it has been helpful. At the same time, he didn't think that NCDOT has been in a position to be totally responsive to concerns that we have expressed. But, Mr. Cowell stated that there is no bigger transportation issue in this State than nonconformity in any area--Charlotte, Forsyth County, or anywhere else. Transportation is a big part of the economy of this State and it would be horrible to have lapses that could impact many areas across the State.

Mike Bruff stated that it is important that staff provide information to decision-makers, such as the Board, to make everyone aware of the air quality issues and potential implications. For those Board members that are really working close with the TIP folks on scheduling and with their local folks to make sure there is consistency in those schedules, then when that draft TIP comes out those areas probably be OK and there won't be a problem. There are some areas that are not getting the same level of communication and there is not enough knowledge to know what is coming out with the draft TIP. So, there may be some surprises there.

Larry Helms stated that there needed to be communication with the Board members on what is going on with that whole process. And, he thought what Mr. Cowell was saying and what he has said is that they are communicating with the C-DOT and the head of the technical staff and we understand there are large critical projects and we try to be as accommodating as possible.

Mark Ahrendsen stated that he wanted to make two points. First, he stated he is a relatively calm person by nature and didn't want his calm demeanor to misrepresent that fact that it is a serious matter and it should be. There is a real consequence and he shares the concern about the consequences of any lapse or any delay in nonattainment areas. He stated that the Durham/Chapel Hill/Carrboro MPO is working with their Board member and he's sure that others are. He did not mean to misrepresent that that is not happening. He fully expects that it is and that everybody is doing the best that they can to ensure that that doesn't happen. But, just to follow up on Roger's point, there's information that we don't know yet. And, with the magnitude of the dollars that he hears about or read about, he was concerned that even with the best efforts and full knowledge we are not going to be able to do it and meet those financial changes that we're reading about. That was not meant to say that there is not a lot of communication going on.

Mark Ahrendsen stated that everyone's long range plans, Charlotte's, Durham's, Raleigh's, Greensboro's, at least in the early years of implementation (2009 and 2010), are based on the 2004-2010 TIP and there is an expectation that the schedule will be maintained in the 2006-2012 TIP. The information we don't fully know yet is what the magnitude of this shift is and what impact the shift might have on air quality conformity.

Ms. Szlosberg stated that it is a huge and very important issue. She stated that she is sure these conversations will continue and that we have a lot of work ahead of us. Ms. Szlosberg adjourned the meeting at 9:55 A.M.

The next meeting for the Environmental Planning and Policy Committee is scheduled for Wednesday, April 6, 2005 at 8:30 A.M. in the Board of Transportation Room (Room 150) of the Transportation Building.

NS/gd

DRAFT RESOLUTION
In Support of the Implementation Plan to Improve the Mapping
And Digital Representation of Surface Waters in North Carolina

Whereas, the Department of Transportation and its partners use maps of surface waters to avoid and minimize impacts to streams and wetlands, to plan and design mitigation projects, to design and construct sedimentation and erosion control measures, to design and construct drainage and stormwater projects on a daily basis; and

Whereas, existing federal, state, and local maps of surface waters are often outdated, inadequate, inaccurate, and inconsistent, and the Department of Transportation and its partners must frequently send staff or consultants to the field to identify the location of surface waters for transportation planning purposes; and

Whereas, other State agencies, local governments, federal agencies, private developers, and non-profit conservation organizations also use maps of surface waters on a daily basis to make environmental and economic decisions; and

Whereas, up-to-date and accurate maps of surface waters made available to government agencies and the public on the internet via NC One Map would increase the productivity and reduce costs for the public and private sectors; and

Whereas, the 2004 General Assembly recognized the limitations of existing maps and directed the Geographic Information Coordinating Council (GICC) and the Department of Environment and Natural Resources to “develop and recommend a plan to improve the mapping and digital representation of surface waters in North Carolina...” to the 2005 General Assembly in SB 1152, Studies Act of 2004 (Session Law 2004-161); and

Whereas, the GICC established a Stream Mapping Working Group of state, local and federal agencies, including the Department of Transportation, to develop the plan; and

Whereas, in four meetings the Stream Mapping Working Group, with the assistance of its consultant Watershed Concepts, determined user requirements, mapping specifications, implementation options, and developed a timeline and a budget for stream mapping; and

Whereas, the State of North Carolina’s substantial investments to update and improve statewide floodplain mapping (using LIDAR technology) can be utilized to improve the mapping and digital representation of surface waters; and

Whereas, at its January 5, 2005 meeting the GICC voted unanimously to adopt the “Implementation Plan to Improve Mapping and Digital Representation of Surface Waters,” at a cost of \$16,236,500 over five years that results in a benefit-cost ratio greater than 2:1; and

Whereas, GICC Chairman Dempsey Benton presented the Implementation Plan to the legislature’s Environmental Review Commission on January 13, 2005.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF TRANSPORTATION AT ITS MEETING IN RALEIGH ON THURSDAY, APRIL 7, 2005:

The Board of Transportation endorses the Implementation Plan to Improve Mapping and Digital Representation of Surface Waters, adopted by the GICC on January 5, 2005 and presented to the General Assembly on January 13, 2005.